

THE NEW COMMUNITY II

**Adjustment to Living in the
Changing Rural Fringe of a
Metropolitan Area**

WADE H. ANDREWS AND J. ROSS ESHLEMAN

**Department of
AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS AND
RURAL SOCIOLOGY**

**OHIO AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION
WOOSTER, OHIO**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

* * * * *

| | |
|--|----|
| Acknowledgments - - - - - | 2 |
| Introduction - - - - - | 3 |
| Distinguishing Concepts of Fringe Migration - - - - - | 3 |
| Social Adjustment - - - - - | 5 |
| Community Satisfaction - - - - - | 5 |
| Satisfaction with Community Services - - - - - | 5 |
| Community Social Participation - - - - - | 11 |
| Participation in Formal Group Activities - - - - - | 11 |
| Religious Participation - - - - - | 11 |
| Farm Bureau and Grange Participation - - - - - | 12 |
| Parent-Teachers Organization Participation - - - - - | 12 |
| Fraternal Groups - - - - - | 12 |
| Women's Church Group - - - - - | 12 |
| Labor Unions - - - - - | 14 |
| Other Formal Participation - - - - - | 14 |
| Summary of Formal Participation - - - - - | 14 |
| Participation in Informal Activities - - - - - | 18 |
| Fairs - - - - - | 18 |
| Group Picnics - - - - - | 18 |
| Movies - - - - - | 18 |
| Group Parties - - - - - | 18 |
| Other Activities - - - - - | 20 |
| Summary of Informal Participation - - - - - | 20 |
| Utilization of Selected Services - - - - - | 20 |
| Clothing - - - - - | 20 |
| Groceries - - - - - | 21 |
| Medical Services - - - - - | 21 |
| Banking - - - - - | 21 |
| Furniture - - - - - | 21 |
| Other Services - - - - - | 21 |
| Summary of Services - - - - - | 21 |
| Community and Institutional Integration - - - - - | 21 |
| Conception of Residential Status - - - - - | 21 |
| Time and Community Understanding - - - - - | 23 |
| Acquaintance Between New and Old Residents - - - - - | 23 |
| Needed Services and Facilities - - - - - | 23 |
| Conflicts of Goals and Ideas - - - - - | 24 |
| Advantages and Disadvantages of Living in the Rural Fringe - - - - - | 24 |
| Opinions of the Consequences of Migration to the Rural Fringe - - - - - | 27 |
| The Impact of Migration on Churches - - - - - | 27 |
| The Impact of Migration on Schools - - - - - | 31 |
| The Impact of Migration on Local Government - - - - - | 31 |
| The Impact of Migration on Community Organization - - - - - | 31 |
| The Impact of Migration on Property Values, Public Services, and Taxes - - - - - | 33 |
| Summary and Conclusions - - - - - | 36 |

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report is the second in a series. The study reported here was a contributing project to the NC-18 North Central Regional Population Research Technical Committee.

In addition to those acknowledged in the first bulletin of this series, special thanks go to Dr. A. R. Mangus who made important comments and criticisms valuable to the analysis of both bulletins.

THE NEW COMMUNITY II . . .

Adjustment to Living in the Changing Rural Fringe of a Metropolitan Area

Wade H. Andrews and J. Ross Eshleman

INTRODUCTION

Adjustment of people and their institutions to living in the major new community in American society is a complex problem involving individuals, families, institutions, and facilities. As shown in the first report of this series, the rural fringe is a moving phenomenon and growing with the spread of the megalopolis or super city¹.

The rural fringe is the unincorporated open country beyond the area which includes the central city and its contiguous suburbs and urbanized area. The space is largely used for farming but its residents are both farmers and non-farmers.

The study is based upon a random sample of the open country residents in the standard metropolitan area of Columbus, Ohio².

The specific areas of discussion of this report include the personal social adjustment of those living in the fringe and the consequences or effects of migration on the social institutions serving the rural fringe as seen by its residents.

Adjustment as it is used here includes several elements. The elements examined were satisfaction, including satisfaction with services and other aspects of the community; participation versus non participation in the new community in activities and organizations; the conception of the residents of belonging to the community; conflicts of opinions among new and old residents; and changes that have occurred in the behavior of the people as well as changes in the function of the institutional systems of the community.

For purposes of this study old residents or non-migrants were defined as those people who had lived

¹Wade H. Andrews and J. Ross Eshleman, *The New Community: Characteristics of Migrant and Non-Migrant Residents in the Rural Fringe of a Metropolitan Area*, Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station Research Bulletin 929, April, 1963. This first report defines major concepts, explains the methodology of the study in detail and describes the characteristics of rural fringe residents: both old residents and new migrants, farm and non-farm.

²*Ibid.*, p.5. For further details of the methodology and sampling method.

in the area before 1940, migrants were defined as those who had moved in since the beginning of that year. The war years actually made only a very slight difference in the number of in-migrants. However, 1940 was used in order to have a point with more base line information available such as the U.S. Census provides.

Distinguishing Concepts of Fringe Migration

In analyzing the adjustment of migrants, it was discovered that certain differences in migration existed. First of all, migration is the movement of one or more person's residence from one place to another. But this is simply the physical fact of a change in place. "Physical migration," however, was not adequate to explain variations among fringe movers. Short and long distance movement were found to show different results of a sociological nature.

A long distance move largely limits the pattern of social interaction of the mover to the new area. Thus, physical migration would be accompanied by a complete move in social activity. The moving of social activity is called here "social migration."

A short range move was one where the mover moved into a different community system but only a few actual miles from his previous residence. In this situation physical migration is not necessarily accompanied by complete social migration, but social migration becomes a perceptibly separate function for the mover and may occur in any degree such as integrating fully to not participating in any new groups.

Much of the migration to the rural fringe of the metropolitan area was found to be of a short range. Specifically 66.5 percent of the rural fringe migrants in this study came from the central city of the area, which would make commuting distance about 8 to 20 miles. Social adjustment to the local community of residence might be measured in part by the degree of social migration. In this study social migration would be manifested in the participation of migrants in the community organizations and informal groups of their new place of residence.



Frequently the expansion of the rural fringe occurs along major highways and roads which lead to the central city. Old farm houses and new houses frequently exist side by side.

SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT

Basic to the problem of the new rural fringe community is the rapid and recent migration of large numbers of urban people into the traditionally rural areas. Adjustment to this phenomenon must occur in the ways of living of the old, largely farm residents as well as by the new non-farm people. In addition, causes of adjustment in the institutions serving the fringe areas may be identified with this migration in important ways. It must be noted, however, that

other factors such as mass media, transportation, general technological advancements in the society as a whole, and demands for higher standards of living by forces outside also affect adjustment in a causal way and the effects of these are not all precisely measurable at this time.

Nevertheless certain aspects of adjustment are measurable, particularly those involving responses of people that were interviewed.

COMMUNITY SATISFACTION

Community satisfaction refers to the feeling of satisfaction as expressed by the respondents who reside in an area with regard to the facilities and the general condition of their community area. A Community Satisfaction Scale was developed to measure this dimension with total scores ranging from a low of 15 to a high of 40³.

The scale items and the frequency of agreement or disagreement among the responses is given in Table 1. As expected from a population who chose to live in the fringe, most of these items were found to be skewed strongly toward the satisfied end of the scale. However, at closer levels of refinement there was strong indication of variation in degree of satisfaction and these variations became useful when analysis was made of the sub-populations of migrants and non-migrants⁴.

Table 2 shows the frequency of the community satisfaction scores for the old residents and the migrants⁵. The higher the score, the higher the degree of satisfaction with the community. Although generally a trend toward satisfaction was shown yet some differences existed. Two and one-half times as large a percentage of migrants had a community satisfaction score of 30 or less compared with the number of non-migrants or old residents with the same score. This is one indication of more com-

munity dissatisfaction among the migrants than among the old residents. At the other extreme more than twice as great a percentage of old residents had a high community satisfaction score.

Satisfaction With Community Services

One would expect a relationship to exist between general community satisfaction and the satisfaction with specific community services and needs. This expectation was verified by correlating the Community Satisfaction Scale Scores (Table 2) with a Community Service Satisfaction Score. The correlation between the two total scores was .85 which gives an indication of a high positive relationship between the two variables; community satisfaction and community service satisfaction. The items measured satisfaction with such services and needs as water supply, police protection, streets and roads, neighborhood shopping, fire protection, and recreational facilities. The responses can be seen in Tables 3 to 8.

As with community satisfaction the majority response was generally favorable to the various services listed. However, some examination of the variation in satisfaction and dissatisfaction is warranted.

From the six services and needs mentioned, water supply had the most favorable response. Approximately 90 percent of the fringe respondents were satisfied with their water supply with only three percent expressing dissatisfaction. Since this water is practically all from privately drilled wells most of which require elaborate water softeners and filters, this result was not expected.

Second to water supply in favorable response, was that of police protection. Approximately 80 percent of the respondents were very or quite satisfied and another 14 percent were fairly satisfied. Only six percent of all the responses indicated a response of very or quite dissatisfied.

Streets and roads ranked third in terms of favorableness of response. Seventy-four percent of the

³For single item internal consistency see: Hans Sebald and Wade H. Andrews, "Family Integration and Related Factors in a Rural Fringe Population," *Journal of Marriage and Family Living*, November, 1962.

⁴Migrants were those who had moved into the rural fringe since 1940 or before this phenomena began to occur in large numbers, and non-migrants were those who had lived there before that time.

The authors are aware of the methodological limitations of this kind of category comparison. It is impossible to know the extent to which observed differences are due to the origins of the respondents and how much the differences are due to uncontrolled factors such as age, religion, stage in family life cycle, occupation, status rank, political affiliations, or conservatism-liberalism. However, a control by age on several variables discussed in the first bulletin did not show any change in the results of the study.

⁵The result of making an analysis of variance test showed that a difference greater than the .01 level of significance exists.

The split-half formula for reliability yielded a coefficient of reliability of .86. After correction with the Spearman-Brown formula, a coefficient of reliability of .89 was obtained.

Table 1. Community Satisfaction Scale Items and Distribution of all Responses.

| Scale Item | Degree of Agreement | | | | |
|--|---------------------|-----------------|-----------|--------------------|-------------------|
| | Strongly Agree | Partially Agree | Undecided | Partially Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| 1. People on a whole mind their own business. | 213 | 80 | 3 | 6 | 1 |
| 2. Families in this community keep their children under control, & teach them to respect other people's rights and property. | 209 | 79 | 7 | 6 | 2 |
| 3. The community has to put up with poor school facilities. | 204 | 68 | 11 | 14 | 6 |
| 4. It is difficult to get accepted into community organizations around here. | 178 | 64 | 33 | 23 | 5 |
| 5. I feel very much that I belong here. | 216 | 52 | 24 | 8 | 3 |
| 6. The community may well be proud of its places of worship. | 160 | 103 | 24 | 11 | 5 |
| 7. It is not rewarding to spend the time in organizations in this community. | 128 | 90 | 51 | 30 | 4 |
| 8. There are not many families you would care to marry into. | 119 | 77 | 54 | 37 | 16 |
| 9. Our schools do a good job for preparing young people for life. | 172 | 121 | 6 | 1 | 3 |
| 10. Every school wants to be the biggest and most impressive. | 125 | 82 | 24 | 63 | 9 |

Table 2. Scores of Community Satisfaction Scale for Old Residents and Migrants.

| Community Satisfaction Score | Old Residents | Migrants | Total |
|------------------------------------|------------------|------------|-------------|
| 15 | - | 1 | 1 |
| 18 | - | 1 | 1 |
| 20 | - | 3 | 3 |
| 15-20 | (0.0%) | 5 (2.9%) | 5 (1.6%) |
| 21 | - | 1 | 1 |
| 22 | 1 | 6 | 7 |
| 23 | - | 6 | 6 |
| 24 | 2 | 4 | 6 |
| 25 | - | 10 | 10 |
| 21-25 | 3 (2.2%) | 27 (15.9%) | 30 (9.9%) |
| 26 | 2 | 13 | 15 |
| 27 | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| 28 | 2 | 10 | 12 |
| 29 | 6 | 10 | 16 |
| 30 | 7 | 17 | 24 |
| 26-30 | 21 (15.8%) | 54 (31.8%) | 75 (24.8%) |
| 31 | 5 | 6 | 11 |
| 32 | 8 | 9 | 17 |
| 33 | 6 | 8 | 14 |
| 34 | 11 | 12 | 23 |
| 35 | 4 | 7 | 11 |
| 31-35 | 34 (25.6%) | 42 (24.7%) | 76 (25.1%) |
| 36 | 4 | 7 | 11 |
| 37 | 9 | 3 | 12 |
| 38 | 6 | 2 | 8 |
| 39 | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| 40 | 52 | 29 | 81 |
| 36-40 | 75 (56.4%) | 42 (24.7%) | 117 (38.6%) |
| Total | 133 | 170 | 303 |
| | 100 | 100 | 100 |

F = 52.26 Probability Level Above .01

Table 3. Satisfaction with the Water Supply by Old Residents and Migrants

| Water Supply | Old Residents | | Migrants | | Total | |
|----------------------------|---------------|---------|----------|---------|--------|---------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Very or Quite Satisfied | 121 | 91.0 | 150 | 88.3 | 271 | 89.4 |
| Fairly Satisfied | 9 | 6.8 | 14 | 8.2 | 23 | 7.6 |
| Very or Quite Dissatisfied | 3 | 2.2 | 6 | 3.5 | 9 | 3.0 |
| Total | 133 | 100.0 | 170 | 100.0 | 303 | 100.0 |

$\chi^2 = .59$ d.f. = 1 No Statistical Difference.

respondents were very or quite satisfied with the streets in their community. Approximately 10 percent expressed a dissatisfaction with this item.

No significant differences exist between the responses of the old residents and migrants on any of the first three services.

The remaining three needs or services, neighborhood shopping, fire protection, and recreational activities, showed a significant difference between the responses of the old residents and migrants.

Neighborhood shopping had a more favorable response from the old residents than from the migrants. More than 85 percent of the old residents were very or quite satisfied with the shopping facilities with only three percent expressing dissatisfaction. For the migrants, only 64 percent were very or quite satisfied with 8 percent expressing dissatisfaction.

A significant difference in response exists between the old residents and migrants as to the satisfaction with fire protection. The old residents expressed greater satisfaction and less dissatisfaction with this service.

The facility which received the least favorable response of the six mentioned needs or services was that of recreation. Less than half of the respondents, 43.9 percent, were very or quite satisfied, while 17.2 percent were very or quite dissatisfied. A significant difference exists between the residents and migrants with the old residents expressing more satisfaction and less dissatisfaction.

Thus, in the three areas that indicate a significant difference between the old residents and migrants, the migrants express the most dissatisfaction.

Table 4. Satisfaction With Police Protection by Old Residents and Migrants.

| Police Protection | Old Residents | | Migrants | | Total | |
|----------------------------|---------------|---------|----------|---------|--------|---------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Very or Quite Satisfied | 107 | 80.4 | 133 | 78.2 | 240 | 79.2 |
| Fairly Satisfied | 17 | 12.8 | 27 | 15.9 | 44 | 14.5 |
| Very or Quite Dissatisfied | 9 | 6.8 | 10 | 5.9 | 19 | 6.3 |
| Total | 133 | 100.0 | 170 | 100.0 | 303 | 100.0 |

$\chi^2 = .63$ d.f. = 2 No Statistical difference.

Table 5. Satisfaction with Streets and Roads by Old Residents and Migrants

| Streets and Roads | Old Residents | | Migrants | | Total | |
|----------------------------|---------------|---------|----------|---------|--------|---------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Very or Quite Satisfied | 104 | 78.2 | 122 | 71.7 | 226 | 74.6 |
| Fairly Satisfied | 19 | 14.3 | 28 | 16.5 | 47 | 15.5 |
| Very or Quite Dissatisfied | 10 | 7.5 | 20 | 11.8 | 30 | 9.9 |
| Total | 133 | 100.0 | 170 | 100.0 | 303 | 100.0 |

$\chi^2 = 2.00$ d.f. = 2 No Statistical difference.

Table 6. Satisfaction with Neighborhood Shopping by Old Residents and Migrants

| Neighborhood Shopping | Old Residents | | Migrants | | Total | |
|----------------------------|---------------|---------|----------|---------|--------|---------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Very or Quite Satisfied | 115 | 86.5 | 109 | 64.2 | 224 | 73.9 |
| Fairly Satisfied | 14 | 10.5 | 47 | 29.6 | 61 | 20.1 |
| Very or Quite Dissatisfied | 4 | 3.0 | 14 | 8.2 | 18 | 6.0 |
| Total | 133 | 100.0 | 170 | 100.0 | 303 | 100.0 |

$\chi^2 = 19.34$ d.f. = 2 Probability Level Above .01

Table 7. Satisfaction with Fire Protection by Old Residents and Migrants

| Fire Protection | <u>Old Residents</u> | | <u>Migrants</u> | | <u>Total</u> | |
|----------------------------|----------------------|---------|-----------------|---------|--------------|---------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Very or Quite Satisfied | 104 | 78.2 | 103 | 60.6 | 207 | 68.3 |
| Fairly Satisfied | 27 | 20.3 | 58 | 34.1 | 85 | 28.1 |
| Very or Quite Dissatisfied | 2 | 1.5 | 9 | 5.3 | 11 | 3.6 |
| Total | 133 | 100.0 | 170 | 100.0 | 303 | 100.0 |

$\chi^2 = 10.69$ d.f. = 1 Probability Level Above .01

Table 8. Satisfaction with Recreational Activities by Old Residents and Migrants

| Recreational Facilities | <u>Old Residents</u> | | <u>Migrants</u> | | <u>Total</u> | |
|----------------------------|----------------------|---------|-----------------|---------|--------------|---------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Very or Quite Satisfied | 65 | 48.9 | 68 | 40.0 | 133 | 43.0 |
| Fairly Satisfied | 56 | 42.1 | 62 | 36.5 | 118 | 38.9 |
| Very or Quite Dissatisfied | 12 | 9.0 | 40 | 23.5 | 52 | 17.2 |
| Total | 133 | 100.0 | 170 | 100.0 | 303 | 100.0 |

$\chi^2 = 11.11$ d.f. = 2 Probability Level Above .01

COMMUNITY SOCIAL PARTICIPATION

Community social participation refers to the diverse activities engaged in by individuals who live in a particular locale. The participation may be identified as formal or informal. Formal social participation refers to the part taken in organized groups and includes attendance at meetings, memberships maintained, financial contributions made, committee work done, and offices held. Informal social participation embraces all social life that is not of an organizational or formal nature, such as friends going shopping together, visiting, group parties or picnics, attending fairs, movies, dances, plays and others.

Leaders are frequently concerned as to how their church, school board, social club or professional organization can reach more people. Thus, it is of interest to these individuals to know the extent of community participation, where the community members go to participate, what factors promote organized activities more than others, and why some organizations may fail entirely while others continue to grow.

This section describes the extent of participation in organized or formal activities and in informal activities that occur among rural fringe residents. Emphasis is placed in which the activity occurs rather than on motivation and interaction within groups.

PARTICIPATION IN FORMAL GROUP ACTIVITIES

Data were gathered for 26 formal activities. The respondents were asked if they participated in any of the selected formal activities and the location of the activities in which they participated. The locations of participation were subdivided into three categories: (1) their present community of residence, (2) a previous community of residence, and (3) other than a previous or present community of residence (see Tables 10 and 11).

Important variations were evident in the degree of social migration which occurred between the different formally organized groups. Those groups showing the most rapid and complete transference of participation to the new communities by migrants were parent teachers associations and Sunday schools (Table 11). These were most closely associated with children's activities which seem to be locally oriented.

Those showing partial but major transfer of participation were church, farm organizations, women's church groups and bridge clubs (Table 11).

Those that had a relatively small proportion of social migration were fraternal groups, labor unions, occupational and professional groups, business groups and veterans clubs. Some of these, however, were associated with the job and most of the migrants' jobs were in the central city.

Several other types of groups were reported, but with very small numbers of participants.

Religious Participation

Only one activity was performed by more than one third of the rural fringe residents. This activity, church participation, was mentioned by 84.8 percent of the respondents, (see Table 9). Of the individuals who participate in church activities, approximately three-fourths participate in their present community.

Another 18 percent drive from the rural fringe to Columbus and the others participate elsewhere.

Distance to Church. It was found that 38.4 percent lived within two and one-half miles of the church they attend, 30.2 percent lived from two and one-half miles to 4.9 miles, 29.1 percent lived from five to fifteen miles and the remaining 2.3 percent drive more than fifteen miles.

Activity in Church. There is a significant difference between the old residents and migrants in the extent of church participation. In general, old residents are more active in church activities than are migrants (Table 12). Offices held or committee membership involved a total of 28.5 percent of the old residents and only 8.2 percent of the migrants. Also, only 8 percent of the old residents had no participation as compared to 20 percent of the migrants.

This pattern of change in leadership participation or control of social institutions suggests that there are stages that can be identified in the process of changing power from rural to urban people. Just as there is invasion and urbanization in terms of land use, so too there is invasion and urbanization of social systems. A tentative classification of stages in this process of shift of social power may be as follows:

1. Old resident membership and leadership.
2. Mixed old resident and migrant with old residents in control of social systems with stability generally maintained.
3. Mixed, but with migrants in considerable majority, challenging old leadership and showing areas of conflict in organizational decisions.
4. Mixed membership with migrants largely in control and rapid shifting of social systems.
5. Urbanized membership and leadership.

These stages need not all follow at an even rate. They may be stabilized or even conceivably reversed, but they would appear to be theoretically logical and occur where urban population is increasing. This would fit the concept of continually spreading or creeping urbanization discussed in the first bulletin of this New Community Series⁶.

This difference in activity implies a variation in integration into church leadership between the new and old residents. Although social migration in church participation had occurred for a large number, old residents were still generally in control of the rural fringe church as in stages two and three above. The formal participation of the rural fringe residents shows that the church greatly outnumbers all other organizations in percent of participation for both old and new residents. In the typical situation participants attended a church in the local area, traveled less than five miles to attend, and they had been members for fifteen years or more.

The church attenders were not necessarily Sunday School attenders. Whereas 84.8 percent of the respondents participated in overall church activities, only 31.7 percent of the respondents participated in Sunday school activities. The large majority of Sunday School participation, 94.9 percent, occurs in the present community of residence. This element of social migration occurred at an early stage. Although less than one-third of the respondents participated in Sunday School, this specific formal activity was second only to general church participation.

Farm Bureau and Grange Participation

The third most active form of organizational participation was in two farmers' organizations, Farm Bureau and the Grange. More than one fourth, 27.7 percent, of all fringe residents belonged to one or both of these organizations. However, a comparison of the old residents with the migrants showed that only 14.7 percent of the migrants compared to 44.4 percent of the old residents participated in these farm organizations. It should be pointed out that 78.6 percent of the old residents lived on farms⁷.

The place of participation differs also. For migrants (see Table 11), 56.0 percent participate in their present community of residence compared to 69.5 percent of the old residents (see Table 10). Also, 16 percent of the migrants participate in a previous community of residence compared to only 5.1 percent of the old residents.

⁶Andrews and Eshleman, *op. cit.*

⁷*Ibid.*, p. 12.

Parent-Teachers Association Participation

The most active form of organizational participation was in the parent-teachers association of the schools. Approximately one fourth of the respondents participated in this activity (see Table 9). Twice as large a percentage of migrants as old residents participated. This can be explained in part by the fact that there were a greater number of children living at home among the migrants⁸. Approximately 92 percent of the respondents attended the P.T.A. in their present community of residence with the other 8 percent going to a previous community of residence or a community other than a place of residence. Here the affect of a legal structure, the school district to which children must attend in the local area, makes social migration virtually equivalent to physical migration.

Fraternal Groups

Fraternal Groups (see Table 9) ranked next to the P.T.A. in frequency of participation. Fraternal groups included the Masonic Order, Moose, and "other fraternal groups." Approximately one fifth of the respondents engaged in one or more of these groups, with approximately the same percentage of migrants as old residents. However, a major difference existed between the old residents and the migrants as to the location of their participation (see Tables 11 and 12). In this case, as might be expected, social migration was retarded. Only 20 percent of the migrants compared to 82.8 percent of the old residents participated in their present community of residence. Sixty-six percent of the migrants participated in their previous community of residence compared to 12 percent of the old residents. This indicates that although the migrants have moved physically, some social activities aid in the maintenance of social and psychological ties to their past place of residence.

Women's Church Group

Approximately 13 percent of the women in the rural fringe participate in a women's church group. This includes 15.8 percent of the old residents and 11.2 percent of the migrants. Eighty-seven percent of the old resident participants attend a women's church group in their present community of residence compared to 57.9 percent of the migrants. For the migrants, the church womens' groups continue to be one source of linkage that contributes to the maintenance of an identity with a past community of residence.

⁸*Ibid.*, p. 9.

Table 9. Participation in Formally Organized Groups by All Respondents and by Old Residents and Migrants

| Organization | <u>Old Residents</u> | | <u>Migrants</u> | | <u>Yes</u> | | <u>Total</u> | | <u>No</u> |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|---------|-----------------|---------|------------|---------|--------------|---------|-----------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | |
| Church | 122 | 91.7 | 135 | 79.4 | 257 | 84.8 | 46 | 15.2 | |
| Sunday School | 58 | 43.6 | 38 | 22.4 | 96 | 31.7 | 207 | 68.3 | |
| Farm Bureau and/or Grange | 59 | 44.4 | 25 | 14.7 | 84 | 27.7 | 219 | 72.3 | |
| P.T.A. | 17 | 12.8 | 56 | 32.9 | 73 | 24.1 | 230 | 75.9 | |
| Fraternal Groups ^a | 29 | 21.8 | 32 | 18.8 | 61 | 20.1 | 242 | 79.9 | |
| Women's Church Group | 21 | 15.8 | 19 | 11.2 | 40 | 13.2 | 263 | 86.8 | |
| Labor Unions | 5 | 3.8 | 27 | 15.9 | 32 | 10.6 | 271 | 89.4 | |
| Occupational or Professional Groups | 6 | 4.5 | 21 | 12.4 | 27 | 8.9 | 276 | 91.1 | |
| Bridge Clubs | 8 | 6.0 | 13 | 7.6 | 21 | 6.9 | 282 | 93.1 | |
| Veterans Groups ^b | 8 | 6.0 | 13 | 7.6 | 21 | 6.9 | 282 | 93.1 | |
| Men's Church Group | 14 | 10.5 | 5 | 2.9 | 19 | 6.3 | 284 | 93.7 | |
| Business Groups | 3 | 2.2 | 15 | 8.8 | 18 | 5.9 | 285 | 94.1 | |
| Agricultural Groups ^c | 18 | 13.5 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 5.9 | 285 | 94.1 | |
| Civic Groups ^d | 6 | 4.5 | 7 | 4.1 | 13 | 4.3 | 290 | 95.7 | |
| Extension Groups ^e | 8 | 6.0 | 3 | 1.8 | 11 | 3.6 | 292 | 96.4 | |
| School Boards | 7 | 5.3 | 2 | 1.2 | 9 | 3.0 | 294 | 97.0 | |
| Political Groups | 5 | 3.8 | 1 | 0.6 | 6 | 2.0 | 297 | 98.0 | |
| Youth Groups | 1 | 0.8 | 4 | 2.4 | 5 | 1.6 | 298 | 98.4 | |
| Other | 3 | 2.2 | 11 | 6.5 | 14 | 4.6 | 289 | 95.4 | |

Old Residents n = 133, Migrants n = 170, Total N = 303

a = Masonic Order, Moose, and "other Fraternal groups."

b = American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars

c = Agricultural Association and Dairy Herd Improvement Association

d = Lions and other Civic groups

e = County Agricultural Extension Council and Home Demonstration Council

Labor Unions

The last formal organization to which more than 10 percent of the respondents participate is that of labor unions (see Table 9). A comparison of the old residents and migrants shows that 3.8 percent of the old residents and 15.9 percent of the migrants participate in this type of organization. This contrast of more than 12 percent between the two groups is due largely to occupational differences. Fifty-seven percent of the old residents are farmers by occupation compared to 11.8 percent of the migrants and only 23.4 percent of the old residents are professional, technical, sales craftsmen, or operatives, compared to 75.3 percent of the migrants⁹.

No old residents participate in a labor union within their own community of residence (see Table 10). Most migrants, 70.4 percent, participate in a previous community of residence with only 22 percent participating in a labor union that is not in a present or previous community of residence (see Table 11).

Other Formal Participation

There are several other formal groups that include a smaller percentage of the respondents but which are important determining factors in maintaining a linkage with the local or other communities.

Approximately nine percent of all respondents participate in an occupational or professional group other than unions. About 12 percent of the migrants and 4.5 percent of the residents participate in this activity. Both old residents and migrants go outside their present community of residence for this activity.

Bridge clubs are participated in by 6.9 percent of the respondents. There is little difference in the percentage of participation by the old residents and migrants, however, there is a 26 percent difference between the old residents and migrants in where they participate. Migrants more frequently return to a previous community of residence.

Veterans groups include the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars. These two groups included 6.9 percent of the respondents with approximately an equal percentage of participation from the old residents and migrants. A wide variation exists between the old residents and the migrants as to the place of participation. For old residents, 85.7 percent participate in their present community of residence compared

to 14.3 percent of the migrants. On the other hand, 71.4 percent of the migrants participate in a previous community of residence.

Men's church groups contain a smaller percentage of fringe residents than do women's church groups, the percentages being 6.3 and 13.2 respectively. More than three times as large a percentage of old residents as migrants participated in this activity. All the old residents who participated in men's church groups did so in their present community of residence.

Business groups were participated in by 5.9 percent of the fringe residents. Exactly four times as large a percentage of migrants as old residents participated in this type of formal organization. Two-thirds of the migrants participated in a business group located in a previous community of residence.

Agricultural groups were participated in by 5.9 percent of the fringe residents. Agricultural groups included the Agricultural Association and the Dairy Herd Improvement Association. No migrants were included in these groups. Half of the old residents participated in agricultural groups in their present community of residence with most of the others participating in a community other than a present or past place of residence.

The remaining formal organizations included less than five percent of the total fringe respondents. This participation can be seen in Tables 9, 10, and 11 respectively.

Summary of Formal Participation

A glance at Table 9 shows that a limited number of organizations provide the major part of the group contacts. Religious and agriculturally related organizations involved the most people and educational and vocational organizations were next.

Among the old residents, most of the participation occurs within the local community as seen in Table 10, whereas among the migrants, Table 11 shows that in many of the formal organizations more than half of the respondents participate in their previous community of residence. This demonstrates a fundamental lag in social migration and consequent differential rates of integration within the new community. A basic consequence of the differential social migration is to, in effect, create a larger community of interaction, that is, to make the whole metropolitan area largely interdependent in an interactive network as well as a service and economic network.

⁹Ibid., Table 9, p. 12.

Table 10. Location of Participation by Place of Residence in Formal Activities by Old Residents. (Non-Participating Old Residents Excluded)

| Activity | <u>Location of Participation by Place of Residence</u> | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|-------|---------------------------|------|---------------------------------------|------|----------------------------|-------|
| | <u>Present Community</u> | | <u>Previous Community</u> | | <u>Other than Previous or Present</u> | | <u>Total Participation</u> | |
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Church | 114 | 93.5 | 1 | 0.8 | 7 | 5.7 | 122 | 100.0 |
| Sunday School | 55 | 94.9 | 1 | 1.7 | 2 | 3.4 | 58 | 100.0 |
| Farm Bureau and/or Grange | 41 | 69.5 | 3 | 5.1 | 15 | 25.4 | 59 | 100.0 |
| P. T. A. | 16 | 94.1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.9 | 17 | 100.0 |
| Fraternal Groups | 24 | 82.8 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 17.2 | 29 | 100.0 |
| Women's Church Group | 20 | 87.0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13.0 | 21** | 100.0 |
| Labor Unions | 0 | - | 0 | - | 5 | - | 5 | - |
| Occupational or Professional Groups | 1 | - | 0 | - | 4 | - | 6* | - |
| Bridge Clubs | 7 | - | 0 | - | 1 | - | 8 | - |
| Veteran's Groups | 6 | - | 0 | - | 1 | - | 8* | - |
| Men's Church Groups | 14 | 100.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 100.0 |
| Business Groups | 1 | - | 1 | - | 1 | - | 3 | - |
| Agricultural Groups | 8 | 50.0 | 2 | 12.5 | 6 | 37.5 | 18* | 100.0 |
| Civic Groups | 5 | - | 0 | - | 1 | - | 6 | - |
| Extension Groups | 6 | - | 0 | - | 2 | - | 8 | - |
| School Boards | 6 | - | 1 | - | 0 | - | 7 | - |
| Political Groups | 3 | - | 0 | - | 2 | - | 5 | - |
| Youth Groups | 0 | - | 0 | - | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| Other | 2 | - | 0 | - | 1 | - | 3 | - |

* Sums do not equal totals due to no data on location by one or two respondents.

** Sums do not equal totals due to individuals who participate at more than one location.

- Total Number of Old Residents Equals 133.

Table 11. Location of Participation by Places of Residence in Formal Activities by Migrants
(Non-Participating Migrants Excluded)

| Activity | Present Community | | Previous Community | | Other than Previous or Present | | Total Participation | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|------|-----------------------|------|-----------------------------------|------|------------------------|-------|
| | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. | No. | Pct. |
| Church | 71 | 52.6 | 47 | 34.8 | 17 | 12.6 | 135 | 100.0 |
| Sunday School | 28 | 73.7 | 7 | 18.4 | 3 | 7.9 | 38 | 100.0 |
| Farm Bureau and/or Grange | 14 | 56.0 | 4 | 16.0 | 7 | 28.0 | 25 | 100.0 |
| P. T. A. | 50 | 89.3 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 10.7 | 56 | 100.0 |
| Fraternal Groups | 6 | 20.0 | 20 | 66.7 | 4 | 13.3 | 32* | 100.0 |
| Women's Church Group | 11 | 57.9 | 6 | 31.6 | 2 | 10.5 | 19 | 100.0 |
| Labor Unions | 2 | 7.4 | 19 | 70.4 | 6 | 22.2 | 27 | 100.0 |
| Occupation or Professional Groups | 3 | 14.3 | 15 | 71.4 | 3 | 14.3 | 21 | 100.0 |
| Bridge Clubs | 8 | 61.5 | 5 | 38.5 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 100.0 |
| Veteran's Clubs | 2 | 14.3 | 10 | 71.4 | 2 | 14.3 | 13** | 100.0 |
| Men's Church Group | 3 | - | 1 | - | 1 | - | 5 | - |
| Business Groups | 3 | 20.0 | 10 | 66.7 | 2 | 13.3 | 15 | 100.0 |
| Agricultural Groups | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Civic Groups | 1 | - | 5 | - | 1 | - | 7 | - |
| Extension Groups | 2 | - | 1 | - | 0 | - | 3 | - |
| School Boards | 2 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 2 | - |
| Political Groups | 0 | - | 1 | - | 0 | - | 1 | - |
| Youth Groups | 1 | - | 2 | - | 1 | - | 4 | - |
| Other | 2 | 18.2 | 6 | 54.5 | 3 | 27.3 | 11 | 100.0 |

* Two respondents gave no data.

** Sums do not equal totals due to individuals who participate at more than one location.

- Total Number of Migrants Reporting Formal Activities Equals 170.

Table 13. Participation in Selected Informal Activities by Old Residents and Migrants.

| Types of Activities | <u>Old Residents</u> | | <u>Migrants</u> | | <u>Total Participation</u> | | | |
|---------------------|----------------------|---------|-----------------|---------|----------------------------|---------|-----------|---------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | <u>Yes</u> | | <u>No</u> | |
| | | | | | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Fairs | 101 | 75.9 | 130 | 76.5 | 231 | 76.3 | 72 | 23.7 |
| Group Picnics | 79 | 59.4 | 117 | 68.8 | 196 | 64.7 | 107 | 35.3 |
| Movies | 63 | 47.4 | 127 | 74.7 | 190 | 62.7 | 113 | 37.3 |
| Group Parties | 68 | 51.1 | 108 | 63.5 | 176 | 58.2 | 127 | 41.8 |
| Athletic Events | 52 | 39.1 | 90 | 52.9 | 142 | 46.9 | 161 | 53.1 |
| Dances | 21 | 15.8 | 63 | 37.1 | 84 | 27.7 | 219 | 72.3 |
| Musical Programs | 26 | 19.5 | 38 | 22.4 | 64 | 21.1 | 239 | 78.9 |
| Plays | 20 | 15.0 | 37 | 21.8 | 57 | 18.8 | 246 | 81.2 |

Old Residents n = 133

Migrants n = 170

Total N = 303

Table 12. Church Participation of Old Residents and Migrants in the Rural Fringe.

| Church Participation | <u>Old Residents</u> | | <u>Migrants</u> | | <u>Total</u> | |
|--|----------------------|---------|-----------------|---------|--------------|---------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| No Participation or no data | 11 | 8.3 | 35 | 20.6 | 46 | 15.2 |
| Member | 2 | 1.5 | 4 | 2.4 | 6 | 2.0 |
| Attend but not a member | 3 | 2.3 | 9 | 5.3 | 12 | 4.0 |
| Attend less than $\frac{1}{2}$ of meetings | 27 | 20.3 | 49 | 28.8 | 76 | 25.1 |
| Attend $\frac{1}{2}$ or more of meetings | 90 | 67.6 | 73 | 42.9 | 163 | 53.7 |
| Committee member last five years | 22 | 16.5 | 8 | 4.7 | 30 | 9.9 |
| Officer last five years | 16 | 12.0 | 6 | 3.5 | 22 | 7.3 |
| Total | 133 | 100.0 | 170 | 100.0 | 303 | 100.0 |

$$\chi^2 = 27.5 \quad 4 \text{ d.f.} \quad \text{Probability Level Above .01}$$

PARTICIPATION IN INFORMAL ACTIVITIES

Data were gathered for eight informal recreational activities. The recreational activities are considered informal in that there are no officers and no regular meeting places or times. The respondents were asked if they participated in any of the selected informal activities and the location of the activities in which they participated.

The eight recreational activities included fairs, group picnics, movies, group parties, athletic events, dances, musical programs, and plays. The frequency of participation was not obtained. The primary interest was in the percentage of respondents who participated in the recreational media available to them and whether or not they participated in their own local area or community of residence.

The location of participation for the old residents and migrants were subdivided into three categories: (1) local *i.e.*, their own or the neighboring fringe community only, (2) Columbus, the central city, only, and (3) a combination of both local and Columbus.

Fairs

The greatest percentage of participants attended fairs. More than 75 percent of the residents participate in this activity. The study was undertaken in a county where both a county fair and the State Fair of Ohio is held. Fifty-five percent of the fair attenders attend only the State Fair held annually in Columbus.

Approximately an equal percentage of old residents as migrants participate in this activity (Table 13). However, 68 percent of the migrants attend only the state fair compared to 37 percent of the old residents. A majority of the old residents compared to 30 percent of the migrants attend fairs at more than one location (Tables 14 and 15). This would indicate more frequent overall fair attendance by the old residents.

A very small number attend a fair only in their local or neighboring community, because the county fair is at Hilliard. Most respondents also attended the state fair.

More than three-fourths of the respondents went to a fair. Attendance at fairs is very infrequent and for brief periods of time but the impact of the fair in influencing human behavior and as an educational media is worthy of additional investigation.

Group Picnics

The second informal recreational activity is that of group picnics. Approximately 65 percent of all respondents engage in this activity with 10 percent more migrants than old residents participating. Overall picnics are most frequently held in the local or

neighboring community. However, 78 percent of the old residents and only 41 percent of the migrants participate locally. Another 20 percent of old residents and 46.2 percent of migrants participated in both local and urban places. Migrants and old residents differed again in their linkage with the urban center. However, it should be noted that picnic activity outside of urban centers was most popular. This result should have implications for activity leaders, officials and others doing planning for outdoor recreation.

Movies

Sixty-two percent of the fringe respondents attend movies. Approximately three-fourths of the migrants engaged in this recreational activity but less than half of the old residents. Of the old residents who did attend movies, only one-fifth went exclusively to Columbus while 62.2 percent of the migrants went there. Over half of the old residents reported participation at both local and Columbus theatres.

Group Parties

The fourth activity is that of group parties. Fifty-eight percent of all respondents reported parties as an activity of participation. Only a slightly higher percentage of migrants participated than did old residents. However, migrants had a much higher frequency of participation in parties in Columbus. Old residents on the other hand, were found to be associating almost exclusively in their own communities.

This type of activity along with picnics and some others usually involves the personal friendship group or clique type associations that are of major importance in local decision making and diffusion of ideas. Social migration was far from complete on this type of association. Because the jobs of most migrants were in the central city this type of association may not be expected to become limited to the local community. It is important that this behavior, often participated in with close friends, reflects strongly the location of those friends as well as the lasting nature of these associations. When these ties and associations are not with other people in the local area, however, it does not permit building networks of leadership that can be effective locally. This pattern of linkage by the migrants with their informal channels of communication and decision making largely outside of the community is associated with the slowness with which the migrants become linked together and with the important decision making groups and systems of the community and why the old residents continue to hold the positions of power even after they are in a minority.

Table 14. Community of Participation in Informal Activities
by Old Residents

| Types of Activities | <u>Location and Degree of Participation</u> | | | | | | <u>Total*</u> No. |
|------------------------|---|------|------------------------|------|------------------------------------|------|----------------------|
| | <u>Local</u> No. | Pct. | <u>Columbus</u> No. | Pct. | <u>Local & Columbus</u> No. | Pct. | |
| Fairs | 5 | 5.0 | 38 | 37.6 | 58 | 57.4 | 101 |
| Group Picnics | 62 | 68.5 | 1 | 1.3 | 16 | 20.2 | 79 |
| Movies | 18 | 28.6 | 13 | 20.6 | 32 | 50.8 | 63 |
| Group Parties | 56 | 82.4 | 2 | 2.9 | 10 | 14.7 | 68 |
| Athletic Events | 11 | 21.1 | 17 | 32.7 | 24 | 46.2 | 52 |
| Dances | 14 | 66.7 | 2 | 9.5 | 5 | 23.8 | 21 |
| Musical Programs | 12 | 46.1 | 8 | 30.8 | 6 | 23.1 | 26 |
| Plays | 12 | 60.0 | 4 | 20.0 | 4 | 20.0 | 20 |

*Those reporting non-participations were not included in this table.

Table 15. Community of Participation in Informal Activities by Migrants.

| Types of Activities | <u>Location and Degree of Participation</u> | | | | | | <u>Total*</u> No. |
|------------------------|---|------|------------------------|------|------------------------------------|------|----------------------|
| | <u>Local</u> No. | Pct. | <u>Columbus</u> No. | Pct. | <u>Local & Columbus</u> No. | Pct. | |
| Fairs | 2 | 1.5 | 89 | 68.5 | 39 | 30.0 | 130 |
| Group Picnics | 48 | 41.0 | 15 | 12.8 | 54 | 46.2 | 117 |
| Movies | 17 | 13.4 | 79 | 62.2 | 31 | 24.4 | 127 |
| Group Parties | 32 | 29.6 | 27 | 25.0 | 49 | 45.4 | 108 |
| Athletic Events | 8 | 8.9 | 49 | 54.4 | 33 | 36.7 | 90 |
| Dances | 11 | 17.5 | 31 | 49.2 | 21 | 33.3 | 63 |
| Musical Programs | 9 | 23.7 | 26 | 71.0 | 2 | 5.3 | 38 |
| Plays | 15 | 40.5 | 19 | 51.4 | 3 | 8.1 | 37 |

*Those reporting non-participators were not included in this table.

Other Activities

The remaining four informal recreational activities are athletic events, dances, musical programs, or plays. Less than 50 percent of the respondents engaged in any of these activities.

Leading this list, is athletic events in which 46.9 percent of the total participated. Migrants participate to a higher degree than old residents.

Approximately 27 percent of the fringe respondents participate in dances. This activity is engaged in by more than twice as large a percentage of migrants as old residents.

Musical programs are participated in by approximately 21 percent of the respondents. A comparison of old residents and migrants shows only a slight difference.

The smallest number of respondents, 18.8 percent, participated in attendance at plays. As with all other activities the migrants had a larger percentage of participation than did the old residents.

In each of these last four activities, athletic events, dances, musical programs, and plays, Columbus was the center of participation for the migrants, whereas for the old residents it was the local or neighboring community; except for athletic events when a combination of both places was reported most.

Summary of Informal Participation

Several characteristics become evident when an over-all glance is taken at the participation of the rural fringe residents in informal recreational activities. First, a larger percentage of migrants than non-migrants participate in each activity except fairs, which are virtually the same. Second, in each activity the old residents participate in a local or neighboring community of residence more than do the migrants, i. e., social migration has not occurred at the informal level. Third, in each activity the migrants participate in Columbus more than do the old residents.

UTILIZATION OF SELECTED SERVICES

Data were gathered for eight selected economic and health services. Five of these needed by virtually all families included clothing, groceries, medical, banking and furniture. Three were needed almost entirely by farmers, including veterinary service, feeds, and the sale of farm produce. For each item, the respondents were asked if they used any of the selected services and the location of their acquiring the service.

As with the informal activities, the frequency of utilization of these services was not obtained.

Clothing

Approximately 99 percent of all respondents selected or bought clothing as shown in Table 16. Very few bought all their clothing locally. But a wide difference exists based on differences in length of residence. Tables 17 and 18 show that only 26.7 percent of the old residents as against 73.2 percent

Table 16: Participation in Selected Services by Old Residents and Migrants

| Services | Old Residents | | Migrants | | Total | | | |
|----------------------|---------------|---------|----------|---------|--------|---------|--------|---------|
| | | | | | Yes | | No | |
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Clothing | 131 | 98.5 | 168 | 98.8 | 299 | 98.7 | 4 | 1.3 |
| Groceries | 130 | 97.7 | 167 | 98.2 | 297 | 98.1 | 6 | 1.9 |
| Medical | 130 | 97.7 | 162 | 95.3 | 292 | 96.4 | 11 | 3.6 |
| Banking | 122 | 91.7 | 149 | 87.6 | 271 | 89.4 | 32 | 10.6 |
| Furniture | 111 | 83.5 | 143 | 84.1 | 254 | 83.9 | 49 | 16.1 |
| Veterinary | 83 | 62.4 | 41 | 24.1 | 124 | 40.9 | 179 | 59.1 |
| Feeds | 85 | 63.9 | 35 | 20.6 | 120 | 39.6 | 183 | 60.4 |
| Sell Farm Produce | 83 | 62.4 | 32 | 18.8 | 115 | 38.0 | 188 | 62.0 |

Old Residents n = 133

Migrants n = 170

Total N = 303

of the migrants bought their clothes only in Columbus. Most old residents, 65.7 percent, bought their clothing both locally and in Columbus, whereas only about one-fourth of the migrants did likewise.

Groceries

Over 98 percent of the respondents reported purchasing groceries. Three-fourths of the old residents purchase groceries only in a local community and 19.2 percent purchased locally and in Columbus. Among migrants, 29.9 percent purchased groceries only in a local community, however 41.3 percent purchased both locally and in Columbus. Food purchases were more closely associated with the local area than any other item.

Medical Services

More than 96 percent of the fringe respondents made use of medical services. Medical services follow similar patterns for newer and older residents as do clothing and groceries, with more local use by old residents.

Banking

Extreme differences exist between the two groupings for banking.

A comparison shows that 84 percent of the old residents compared to 31 percent of the migrants bank in a local community.

Furniture

The fifth service in which more than 80 percent of the respondents participate is that of buying furniture. Old residents and migrants participate about equally, but this item differs from all other items.

Both old residents and migrants go to buy furniture in Columbus. More than 85 percent of the furniture

shopping is done in the central city. In contrast only about three percent of furniture shopping is done in local area.

Other Services

The remaining three services are needed only by farmers. Approximately 40 percent of the respondents use these three services.

Tables 17 and 18 show the difference between old migrant farmers by excluding all respondents not using these services.

In comparing the two farm groups a close similarity was found. The largest percentage of the users of feeds and veterinary services were secured in a local or neighboring community by both old residents and migrants. The largest percentage of those who sold farm produce did so in a combination of both local places and Columbus.

Summary of Services

As with activity participation, old residents derived their services more often from a local or neighboring community. The migrants more often derived their services from Columbus.

In comparing old and migrant farm residents, however, the use of farm services had a very similar pattern. The character of services for an industry may be either local or regional.

In the economic dimension the migrants tend to continue to obtain much of their economic services outside of the local area in similar fashion to that of their social interaction. However, this was not true where it involved the needs of the farm business. The variations in use of local and outside services are useful in analyzing probable business development.

COMMUNITY AND INSTITUTIONAL INTEGRATION

Community integration is defined as the degree to which an individual has accepted the values and norms of the community in which he lives, developed a sense of belonging and identification with the community and is involved in the organized and informal social systems of the community. This implies a knowledge about the community, an understanding of the individuals within the community, a feeling of attachment to the activities and affairs of the community and participation within the community. It is the process of acculturation or adaptation to the new environment that occurs as social migration takes place.

Conception of Residential Status

All the respondents were asked, "Do you think of yourself as an old-time resident or as a newcomer in

this community?" Table 19 indicates that the self image of these people was very accurate in relation to their tenure of residence. Old residents viewed themselves as old residents and the migrants, saw themselves largely as newcomers.

Only five percent of the migrants considered themselves as old residents, whereas approximately one-fourth of the old residents considered themselves as migrants or relative newcomers. This is rather striking evidence of the psychological association with a place or the sense of being of a place. The place one associates with seems to be where the major part of one's childhood or youth was spent or a very long period of residence in one area.

Table 17: Location of Use for Selected Services by Old Residents

| Services | Location | | | | | | | |
|------------|------------|---------|---------------|---------|----------------|---------|--------|---------|
| | Local Only | | Columbus Only | | Local&Columbus | | Total* | |
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Clothing | 10 | 7.6 | 35 | 26.7 | 86 | 65.7 | 131 | 100.0 |
| Groceries | 98 | 75.4 | 7 | 5.4 | 25 | 19.2 | 130 | 100.0 |
| Medical | 67 | 51.6 | 15 | 11.5 | 48 | 36.9 | 130 | 100.0 |
| Banking | 103 | 84.4 | 15 | 12.3 | 4 | 3.3 | 122 | 100.0 |
| Furniture | 4 | 3.6 | 95 | 85.6 | 12 | 10.8 | 111 | 100.0 |
| Veterinary | 69 | 83.1 | 5 | 6.0 | 9 | 10.9 | 83 | 100.0 |
| Feeds | 50 | 58.8 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 41.2 | 85 | 100.0 |
| Sell Farm | | | | | | | | |
| Production | 14 | 16.9 | 11 | 13.2 | 58 | 69.9 | 83 | 100.0 |

*Those reporting non-participation are not included in this table

Table 18: Location of Use for Selected Services by Migrants

| Services | Location | | | | | | Total * | |
|------------|----------|---------|----------|---------|----------------|---------|---------|---------|
| | Local | | Columbus | | Local&Columbu. | | | |
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Clothing | 6 | 3.6 | 123 | 73.2 | 39 | 23.2 | 168 | 100.0 |
| Groceries | 50 | 29.9 | 48 | 28.8 | 69 | 41.3 | 167 | 100.0 |
| Medical | 51 | 31.5 | 79 | 48.8 | 32 | 19.7 | 162 | 100.0 |
| Banking | 47 | 31.5 | 98 | 65.8 | 4 | 2.7 | 149 | 100.0 |
| Furniture | 4 | 2.8 | 124 | 86.7 | 15 | 10.5 | 143 | 100.0 |
| Veterinary | 29 | 70.7 | 5 | 12.2 | 7 | 17.1 | 41 | 100.0 |
| Feeds | 22 | 62.8 | 1 | 2.9 | 12 | 34.3 | 35 | 100.0 |
| Sell Farm | | | | | | | | |
| Production | 10 | 31.2 | 2 | 6.3 | 20 | 62.5 | 32 | 100.0 |

*Those reporting non-participation are not included in this table.

Table 19: Respondents Personal Opinion Concerning Their Own Residential Status As Newcomer or Old Resident

| Residential Status Categories | Old Residents | | Migrants | | Total | |
|-------------------------------|---------------|---------|----------|---------|--------|---------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Migrants | 7 | 5.3 | 130 | 76.5 | 137 | 45.2 |
| Old Resident | 126 | 94.7 | 40 | 23.5 | 166 | 54.8 |
| Total | 133 | 100.0 | 170 | 100.0 | 303 | 100.0 |

$\chi^2 = 152.7$ Significant above the .01 level

Time and Community Understanding

The respondents were asked how many years a newcomer would have to live in the community before he really understood about the leaders, people and institutions of the community. The majority for both the old residents and the migrants thought it required somewhat less than five years. However, over one third felt it took longer than five.

Acquaintance Between New and Old Residents

The rural fringe is in a period of rapid social change. A new neighbor is a common occurrence. Does this have any effect on the difficulty of getting acquainted with other residents? Table 21 shows what occurred when the respondents were asked, "On the whole, do you find it easy or hard to get acquainted with people in this community?"

The old residents and the migrants differ significantly in their opinions as to the difficulty of becoming acquainted. Approximately three times as many migrants, a total of 33 percent, said it was either "hard" or "not so easy," as compared with less than 11 percent of the old residents. On the other hand, nearly 50 percent of the old residents said it was very easy to get acquainted with the community residents compared to only 13.5 percent of the migrants. The indication is that migrants consider it more difficult to become acquainted with the residents of their community than do the old residents. Assuming that one indication of community integration is a feeling of ease in getting to know other community members, the old-timers are more highly integrated than are migrants.

How well do the rural fringe residents think the people within the community know one another? The majority of people answered that they felt that the residents knew one another fairly well (see Table 22).

Somewhat more of the old residents, however, felt that the members of the community knew one another quite well or very well, whereas more migrants felt the community members did not know one another very well.

The respondents were also asked, "In your mind do the new and old residents tend to remain distinct and separate from each other?" (Table 23). A higher degree of consciousness of separation or distinctness of the two groups was felt by the old residents. Eighty-six percent of the old residents replied that the two groups "often" or "sometimes" remained separate, compared to about 58 percent of the migrants.

Needed Services and Facilities

Services and facilities of a public nature were generally not expected to be as adequate in the open country fringe as in urban centers. To test this hypothesis the respondents were asked, "In your opinion, what are some of the services and facilities most needed in your neighborhood?"

Most fringe residents were satisfied with things as they were as shown in Table 24. However, 36 percent reported some needs.

The services or facilities most frequently mentioned as needed were garbage and sewage disposal. In order of importance, other needs were recreation, public transportation, fuel gas, better roads, more stores, fire and police protection, and better telephone

Table 20: Respondents Personal Opinion Concerning the Length of Time Needed To Have a Knowledge of Leaders, People and Institutions of the Community

| Length of Time Needed | Old Residents | | Migrants | | Total | |
|-----------------------|---------------|---------|----------|---------|--------|---------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 0-5 years | 89 | 66.9 | 99 | 58.2 | 188 | 62.0 |
| 6-10 years | 33 | 24.8 | 63 | 37.1 | 96 | 31.7 |
| 11-15 years | 5 | 3.8 | 7 | 4.1 | 12 | 4.0 |
| Over 16 years | 6 | 4.5 | 1 | 0.6 | 7 | 2.3 |
| Total | 133 | 100.0 | 170 | 100.0 | 303 | 100.0 |

$\chi^2 = 2.39$ Not significant

Table 21: Respondents Personal Opinion Concerning the Difficulty to Become Acquainted With Community Residents

| Easy to Become Acquainted | Old Residents | | Migrants | | Total | |
|---------------------------|---------------|---------|----------|---------|--------|---------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| No Data | 1 | 0.7 | 5 | 2.9 | 6 | 2.0 |
| Hard | 5 | 3.8 | 4 | 2.4 | 9 | 3.0 |
| Not so easy | 9 | 6.8 | 52 | 30.6 | 61 | 20.1 |
| Fairly easy | 52 | 39.1 | 86 | 50.6 | 138 | 45.5 |
| Very easy | 66 | 49.6 | 23 | 13.5 | 89 | 29.4 |
| Total | 133 | 100.0 | 170 | 100.0 | 303 | 100.0 |

$$\chi^2 = 56.60$$

$$d.f. = 3$$

Significant above the .01 level

service. No one service, however, was mentioned as needed by more than 5.6 percent of the total respondents.

Small differences occurred in the needs as seen by old residents and the needs as seen by migrants. The most frequently mentioned need as seen by the old residents was better streets and roads. The most frequently mentioned need as seen by the migrants was garbage and sewage disposal.

A rank order correlation between the migrants and old residents showed $r = .49$ which indicates a positive but not highly significant relationship.

The old residents note fewer needed services than do the migrants. Approximately 74 percent of the old residents said no new or additional services are needed in the rural fringe as compared to 57.5 percent of the migrants. This difference was found to be statistically significant.

Conflicts of Goals and Ideas

The respondents were asked if there were any issues on which the old and new residents differed in their opinions. Virtually an equal number felt there were issues of difference between the old and new residents. Six percent of the respondents did not know.

When the responses of the old residents and migrants were classified separately, an interesting result became evident. Approximately 63 percent of the old residents said there was a difference of opinion

compared to only 34.7 percent of the migrants. On the other hand, 33.1 percent of the old residents compared to 56.5 percent of the migrants said there were no differences of opinion on any issues. The indication is that the old residents were more sensitive to differences of opinions than were the migrants. This parallels the results shown by Table 23.

All "yes" respondents to the question on differences in opinion in Table 25 were asked about the specific areas where they felt there was a difference of opinion.

The issues of difference most frequently mentioned, in order of importance were: zoning regulations, taxes, schools, churches, community organizations, and community health facilities (see Table 26). With the exception of community organizations and community health facilities, all other issues were mentioned by more than 25 percent of the "yes" respondents as areas where a difference of opinion existed.

In Table 26 larger percentages of old residents showed differences on all specific issues except that of zoning. This greater response by old residents was indicative of the stronger feelings by old residents toward the changes that were coming about in the fringe.

Advantages and Disadvantages of Living in the Rural Fringe

Old residents and the migrants generally listed similar advantages for living in the rural fringe. A

Table 22: Respondents Personal Opinion Concerning the Extent of All Residents Knowing Each Other

| Extent of Knowing | Old Residents | | Migrants | | Total | |
|--------------------|---------------|---------|----------|---------|--------|---------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Not so well | 11 | 8.3 | 39 | 22.9 | 50 | 16.5 |
| Fairly well | 79 | 59.4 | 98 | 57.7 | 177 | 58.4 |
| Quite or very well | 43 | 32.3 | 33 | 19.4 | 76 | 25.1 |
| Total | 133 | 100.0 | 170 | 100.0 | 303 | 100.0 |

$\chi^2 = 12.93$ 2 = d.f. Significant above the .01 level

Table 23: Respondents Personal Opinion Concerning The Extent That New and Old Residents Tend to Remain Distinct and Separate

| Extent of Separatness | Old Residents | | Migrants | | Total | |
|-----------------------|---------------|---------|----------|---------|--------|---------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| No Data | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1.2 | 2 | 0.7 |
| Often | 46 | 34.6 | 31 | 18.2 | 77 | 25.4 |
| Sometimes | 69 | 51.9 | 67 | 39.4 | 136 | 44.9 |
| Seldom or Never | 18 | 13.5 | 70 | 41.2 | 88 | 29.0 |
| Total | 133 | 100.0 | 170 | 100.0 | 303 | 100.0 |

$\chi^2 = 30.01$ 2 = d.f. Significant above the .01 level

Table 24: Opinions About Services and Facilities Needed in the Rural Fringe

| Services or Facilities | Old Residents | | Migrants | | Total | |
|---------------------------|---------------|---------|----------|---------|--------|---------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| None | 98 | 73.7 | 96 | 57.5 | 194 | 64.0 |
| Public | | | | | | |
| Transportation | 3 | 2.3 | 11 | 6.5 | 14 | 4.6 |
| Recreational | 5 | 3.8 | 11 | 6.5 | 16 | 5.3 |
| Fire & Police | | | | | | |
| Protection | 4 | 3.0 | 3 | 1.3 | 7 | 2.3 |
| Gas | 4 | 3.0 | 10 | 5.9 | 14 | 4.6 |
| Garbage & Sewage | | | | | | |
| Disposal | 4 | 3.0 | 13 | 7.6 | 17 | 5.6 |
| More Stores & | | | | | | |
| Services | 2 | 1.5 | 7 | 4.1 | 9 | 3.0 |
| Better Roads & | | | | | | |
| Streets | 8 | 6.0 | 6 | 3.5 | 14 | 4.6 |
| Better Telephone | | | | | | |
| System | 1 | .7 | 4 | 2.2 | 5 | 1.7 |
| Other | 4 | 3.0 | 9 | 5.3 | 13 | 4.3 |
| Total | 133 | 100.0 | 170 | 100.0 | 303 | 100.0 |

P = .491 Rank order correlation less than .666 required for significance at the .05 level

$\chi^2 = 85.1$ 1 d.f. The test was between no services needed or some service needed. Significant difference at .01 level

Table 25: Differences in Opinions on Issues Between Old Residents and Migrants

| Differences in Opinion | Old Residents | | Migrants | | Total | |
|------------------------|---------------|---------|----------|---------|--------|---------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Yes | 84 | 63.2 | 59 | 34.7 | 143 | 47.2 |
| No | 44 | 33.1 | 96 | 56.5 | 140 | 46.2 |
| Don't Know | 5 | 3.7 | 15 | 8.8 | 20 | 6.6 |
| Total | 133 | 100.0 | 170 | 100.0 | 303 | 100.0 |

$\chi^2 = 3.97$ 1 d.f. Significant at the .05 level

rank order correlation between the responses of the migrants and the old residents yielded a correlation of .80 (see Table 27). Although the two groups gave similar advantages, certain items are worthy of note.

When the responses of all the rural fringe residents are considered, "quietness" is the advantage most frequently mentioned. This item is mentioned by approximately one fourth of all the respondents. The second advantage is "good neighbors," followed by "open country," and "better for children". A desire for certain values generally associated with rural life explains much of the interest in a rural fringe residence.

The old residents mentioned most frequently "good neighbors" followed by "quietness" and "open country". Migrants mentioned four other advantages of fringe living more frequently than they did good neighbors. In order these were "quietness," "better for children," "open country," and "convenient location."

These results are consistent with a study by Kurtz¹⁰ in the Lansing, Michigan, fringe. It was found that the chief advantage for living in the Lansing fringe and the percentages of each were: Not crowded—26%; Quiet, peaceful, freedom, country life, fresh air—21%; Friendly neighbors—17%; Good farm land, near farm market—13%; and Good for children—11%.

OPINIONS OF THE CONSEQUENCES OF MIGRATION TO THE RURAL FRINGE

A general hypothesis regarding migration is that mass migration to suburbia, a fringe locale, or to an urban center, has specific impacts on that locale or community. One section of this study was designed to determine the perception and attitudes of the residents of the rural fringe as to the impact that migration had on specific institutions and social systems that serve them. These would include the churches, schools, local government, and community organizations.

It was expected that migration would affect the existing situation in the rural fringe in many ways. However, it also expected that the residents of the rural fringe, both those who had lived there before the influx of the past decade and the recent migrants, would have certain attitudes about the effects of migration on their community.

Likewise, it was expected that there would be differences between the older and new residents on the way they perceived these effects. It was expected that these differences would show the pattern of cleavages that may occur in this type of situation,

An earlier study by Beagle and Schroeder¹¹ found that North Lansing fringe residents considered the chief advantages of living there to be "more space or space for garden" (24 percent), "right kind of people" (18 percent), "more freedom, or away from city" (18 percent), and "better for kids" (12 percent).

In summary, each study cited, including the present one, found that "quietness," "friendly neighbors," "the open country" and "better for children" are advantages consistently given for living in the rural fringe locale.

The disadvantages of living in the rural fringe show different responses between the old residents and migrants. As shown in Table 28 rather large percentages of both categories saw no disadvantages in fringe living. However, important numbers did report some disadvantages.

A rank order correlation between the migrants and old residents was $r = -.44$ not significant at the .05 level, however, the general trend is toward opposite patterns of opinions about what the disadvantages of the fringe are.

Old residents listed "no disadvantages" significantly more frequently than did migrants.

¹⁰Richard A. Kurtz, Resident Adjustment Patterns in the Rural-Urban Fringe, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, East Lansing, Michigan State University, 1959, p. 208.

¹¹J. Allan Beagle and Widick Schroeder, Social Organization in the North Lansing Fringe, East Lansing, Michigan, Agr. Exp. Sta. Tech. Bull. 251, 1955, p. 22-23.

thus demonstrating the problems inherent in newly developing rural areas.

For each item related to one of the institutions mentioned, the respondents were asked if migration had no effect, improved, or impaired the item under question.

The Impact of Migration on Churches

The respondents were asked, "What effect do you think the people moving into this community have on the following: type of church service, church finances, and cooperation among churches? Wide differences appeared between old and new residents on these items (Table 29).

Approximately 67 percent of the residents felt that migration into the community had no effect on the type of church service. Only 4 percent of the old residents felt that migration had impaired the type of church service and approximately 29 percent felt the church service was improved. A large majority of the migrants, 69 percent, replied that migration improved the type of church service. The other 31 percent of the migrants felt that migration had no effect.

Table 26: Issues on Which Differences of Opinion Existed and the Number of Times Mentioned by Old Residents and Migrants*

| Issues | Old Residents | | Migrants | | Total | |
|------------------|---------------|---------|----------|---------|--------|---------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Zoning | | | | | | |
| Regulations | 68 | 81.0 | 48 | 81.4 | 116 | 81.1 |
| Taxes | 66 | 78.6 | 37 | 62.7 | 103 | 72.0 |
| Schools | 45 | 53.6 | 23 | 39.0 | 68 | 47.6 |
| Churches | 26 | 31.0 | 11 | 18.6 | 37 | 25.9 |
| Community Org. | 7 | 8.3 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4.9 |
| Community Health | | | | | | |
| Facilities | 4 | 4.8 | 1 | 1.7 | 5 | 3.5 |
| Other Community | | | | | | |
| Facilities | 32 | 38.1 | 17 | 28.8 | 49 | 34.3 |

*The total Number of responses does not equal the "N" of 143 because respondents listed as many issues as they felt there were differences of opinion about. The percentages are computed from the number of respondents in each category of residence that answered "yes" to the original item.

Table 27: Advantages Listed by Migrants and Non-Migrants for Living In the Rural Fringe

| Advantages | Old Residents | | Migrants | | Total | |
|----------------|---------------|---------|----------|---------|--------|---------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Quietness | 27 | 20.3 | 46 | 27.2 | 73 | 24.1 |
| Good Neighbors | 33 | 24.8 | 15 | 8.8 | 48 | 15.8 |
| Open Country | 21 | 15.8 | 20 | 11.8 | 41 | 13.5 |
| Better for | | | | | | |
| Children | 8 | 6.0 | 30 | 17.6 | 38 | 12.5 |
| Convenient | | | | | | |
| Location | 7 | 5.3 | 16 | 9.4 | 23 | 7.6 |
| Privacy | 5 | 3.8 | 14 | 8.2 | 19 | 6.3 |
| Expenses Less | 4 | 3.0 | 6 | 3.5 | 10 | 3.3 |
| Health | 4 | 3.0 | 4 | 2.4 | 8 | 2.6 |
| Other | 19 | 14.3 | 13 | 7.6 | 32 | 10.6 |
| Don't Know | 3 | 2.2 | 6 | 3.5 | 9 | 3.0 |
| No Data | 2 | 1.5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0.7 |
| Total | 133 | 100.0 | 170 | 100.0 | 303 | 100.0 |

P = .798 This is higher than .729 needed for rank order correlation probability at the .01 level

Table 28: Disadvantages Listed by Migrants and Non-Migrants for Living In the Rural Fringe

| | Old Residents | | Migrants | | Total | |
|----------------------|---------------|---------|----------|---------|--------|---------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| No Disadvantages* | 74 | 55.6 | 70 | 41.2 | 144 | 47.5 |
| Distance from Work | 4 | 3.0 | 39 | 22.9 | 43 | 14.2 |
| Transportation | 6 | 4.5 | 17 | 10.0 | 23 | 7.6 |
| Facilities not | | | | | | |
| Equal to City | 4 | 3.0 | 18 | 10.6 | 22 | 7.3 |
| Taxes Increasing | 15 | 11.3 | 6 | 3.5 | 21 | 6.9 |
| Close to Columbus | | | | | | |
| and More People | 13 | 9.8 | 3 | 1.8 | 16 | 5.3 |
| Neighbors, Unfriend- | | | | | | |
| ly or Nosy | 3 | 2.3 | 6 | 3.5 | 9 | 3.0 |
| Distance from | | | | | | |
| Stores | 2 | 1.5 | 2 | 1.2 | 4 | 1.3 |
| No gas, water, | | | | | | |
| sewer | 1 | 0.7 | 3 | 1.8 | 4 | 1.3 |
| Other | 11 | 8.3 | 6 | 3.5 | 17 | 5.6 |
| Total | 133 | 100.0 | 170 | 100.0 | 303 | 100.0 |

P = .442 Less than .564 needed to be significant at .05 level

*Difference between old residents and migrants on percent stating no disadvantages

$\chi^2 = 6.26$ significant above the .02 level

Table 29: Effects of Migration on Church Services, Finances and Cooperation
Among Churches as Viewed by Old Residents and Migrants

| Types of Effects | Old Residents | | Migrants | | Total | |
|---|---------------|---------|----------|---------|--------|---------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Church Service ¹ | | | | | | |
| Improved | 38 | 28.6 | 117 | 68.8 | 155 | 51.1 |
| No effect | 89 | 66.9 | 53 | 31.2 | 142 | 46.9 |
| Impaired | 6 | 4.5 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2.0 |
| Total | 133 | 100.0 | 170 | 100.0 | 303 | 100.0 |
| ----- | | | | | | |
| Church Finances ² | | | | | | |
| Improved | 101 | 75.9 | 145 | 85.3 | 246 | 81.2 |
| No effect | 27 | 20.3 | 25 | 14.7 | 52 | 17.2 |
| Impaired | 5 | 3.8 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1.6 |
| Total | 133 | 100.0 | 170 | 100.0 | 303 | 100.0 |
| ----- | | | | | | |
| Cooperation Among Churches ³ | | | | | | |
| Improved | 28 | 21.1 | 92 | 54.1 | 120 | 39.6 |
| No effect | 85 | 63.9 | 71 | 41.8 | 156 | 51.5 |
| Impaired | 20 | 15.0 | 7 | 4.1 | 27 | 8.9 |
| Total | 133 | 100.0 | 170 | 100.0 | 303 | 100.0 |

1 - $\chi^2 = 51.7$

d.f. = 2 Significant at .01 level

2 - $\chi^2 = 4.3$

d.f. = 1 Significant at .01 level

3 - $\chi^2 = 47.9$

d.f. = 2 Significant at .01 level

In comparing migrants and old residents on the impact of migration on church finances 76 percent of the old residents felt there had been improvement while 85 percent of the migrants reported improvement. Twenty percent of the old residents compared to 14.7 percent of the migrants replied that the impact of migration had no effect on church finances. Only a few old residents thought they had been impaired. There is relatively general agreement on the effect of migration on finances but the differences were still great enough to be significantly different between the two groups.

On the effect of migration on changes in cooperation among the different churches there was a considerable difference. Improved cooperation was given by 54.1 percent of the migrants compared to only 21.1 percent of the old residents. The belief that cooperation had been impaired was given by 4.1 percent of the migrants and 15 percent of the old residents. The indication is that more old residents tended to feel that migration did not improve the cooperation among churches, whereas the migrants were divided on the matter.

In summary, each of the three variables used to discover the impact of migration on the churches showed the migrants had had significantly different percentages reporting improvement. For all respondents, 51 percent felt the type of church services was improved; 81 percent felt finances had been improved but only 40 percent felt there had been improvement in the cooperation among churches. None of the three variables showed the churches had been impaired by the change.

The Impact of Migration on Schools

The respondents were asked, "What effects do you think the people moving into this community have on the following: school curriculum, school size, quality of school teachers, and school buildings and equipment. Specific responses can be seen in Table 30.

The general response toward the impact of immigration on the school curriculum was that it had been favorable. However, the migrants again more frequently mentioned an improved curriculum than did the old residents.

The size of rural schools have become a basic factor in school consolidation in recent years. The change in the size of schools was stated as an improvement by 82.2 percent of the total respondents.

One-fourth of the old residents felt that the school size had been impaired compared to only 4.7 percent of the migrants. On the other hand, 71.4 percent of the old residents and 90.6 percent of the migrants

responded that the size of the schools had been improved. The general response was one of improvement, but the migrants were more favorable.

Overall, approximately three-fourths of all the respondents felt that an improvement in the quality of school teachers had resulted as a consequence of migration. However, attitudes on this factor were the most widely variable. A response of improved was given by 87.6 percent of the migrants compared to 54.9 percent of the old residents.

The most favorable attitudes toward the impact of migration on schools was with the buildings and equipment. The response of the migrants was again somewhat more favorable than that of the old residents.

In summary, each variable used to measure the impact of migration on the schools had significantly different responses between the old residents and the migrants. The general attitude toward the impact of migration on the schools was that they had been improved. In general, schools have had a popular appeal and have enjoyed very favorable public support. Evidence of some resentment by old residents appears in the attitude toward the effect of the change in size. This seems to reflect some of the sentiment toward consolidation and the loss of the school as a neighborhood social system.

The Impact of Migration on Local Government

One local institution that has tended to resist change is local government. With an influx of migrants into this particular fringe locale, additional responsibilities were placed on government officials both at the township and county level. The respondents were asked what effect they thought the people moving into the community had on local government.

A majority of both groups felt little change had occurred, however almost one-fourth of the old residents felt the effect of migration had had a bad effect on local government. On the other hand over 40 percent of the newcomers expressed the belief that there had been some improvement. These differences were significant and reflected again the variation in adjustment between new and old residents.

The Impact of Migration on Community Organization

The respondents were asked what they thought were the effects that people moving into their community had on the following: leadership of community organizations, finances of community organizations, and cooperation among community organizations. Specific responses can be seen in Table 32.

Almost twice as high a percentage of migrants as old residents felt that community leadership had been improved by migration. Less than one percent of the

Table 30: Effects of Migration on School Curriculum, Size, Quality of Teachers, Buildings and Equipment as Viewed by Old Residents and Migrants

| Types of Effects | Old Residents | | Migrants | | Total | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|---------|----------|---------|--------|---------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| <hr/> | | | | | | |
| Curriculum ¹ | | | | | | |
| Improved | 80 | 60.2 | 151 | 88.8 | 231 | 76.2 |
| No effect | 43 | 32.3 | 16 | 9.4 | 59 | 19.5 |
| Impaired | 10 | 7.5 | 3 | 1.8 | 13 | 4.3 |
| Total | 133 | 100.0 | 170 | 100.0 | 303 | 100.0 |
| <hr/> | | | | | | |
| Size ² | | | | | | |
| Improved | 95 | 71.4 | 154 | 90.6 | 249 | 82.2 |
| No effect | 5 | 3.8 | 8 | 4.7 | 13 | 4.3 |
| Impaired | 33 | 24.8 | 8 | 4.7 | 41 | 13.5 |
| Total | 133 | 100.0 | 170 | 100.0 | 303 | 100.0 |
| <hr/> | | | | | | |
| Quality of Teachers ³ | | | | | | |
| Improved | 73 | 54.9 | 149 | 87.6 | 222 | 73.3 |
| No effect | 55 | 41.3 | 20 | 11.8 | 75 | 24.7 |
| Impaired | 5 | 3.8 | 1 | .6 | 6 | 2.0 |
| Total | 133 | 100.0 | 170 | 100.0 | 303 | 100.0 |
| <hr/> | | | | | | |
| Buildings and Equipment ⁴ | | | | | | |
| Improved | 103 | 77.4 | 158 | 92.9 | 261 | 86.1 |
| No effect | 11 | 8.3 | 8 | 4.7 | 19 | 6.3 |
| Impaired | 19 | 14.3 | 4 | 2.4 | 23 | 7.6 |
| Total | 133 | 100.0 | 170 | 100.0 | 303 | 100.0 |

1 - $\chi^2 = 35.67$

d.f. = 2 Significant at .01 level

2 - $\chi^2 = 25.77$

d.f. = 2 Significant at .01 level

3 - $\chi^2 = 40.89$

d.f. = 1 Significant at .01 level

4 - $\chi^2 = 17.57$

d.f. = 2 Significant at .01 level

migrants felt that community leadership had been harmed compared to 12 percent of the old residents.

Almost two-thirds of the total respondents felt that community finances had been improved due to migration. The migrants more frequently reported community finances had been improved. The old residents reported a higher proportion of no effect answers.

A significant difference existed between new and old residents on the effect of migration on cooperation among organizations of the community. Seventy percent of the old residents gave a no effect response to the question. The migrants more consistently gave a response of improved. Less than one percent felt that migration harmed the cooperation among organizations.

In summary, with each community organization variable there was a significant difference in response between the old residents and migrants. The migrants, as before, consistently gave the higher percentage of "improved" responses, and the old residents consistently gave the highest percentage of impaired or no effect responses.

The Impact of Migration on Property Value, Public Services and Taxes

The partial change from agriculture to residential land use in the rural fringe, along with the requirements for new and improved services by the expanded population, were expected to have their effects upon land values and taxes all of which would have considerable impact upon traditional land use. These changes were expected to be reflected in the attitudes of the residents of the area.

The fact that many new migrants were from urban origins was expected to show a difference in the pattern of their attitudes from those of the old residents who were largely farmers.

The respondents were asked what effects they thought the people moving into their community had on the following: property values, public services, and taxes. The responses can be seen in Table 33.

The large majority of the respondents, almost 9 out of 10 replied that property values were improved because of the in-migration of people to the rural fringe area. Improved here is believed to be synonymous with increase in value. On the other hand 7.5 percent of old residents as against 1.2 percent of the migrants felt that property values had been impaired.

When compared to property value, there was much less agreement on the impact of migration on public services.

Significant differences in response were noted with fewer old residents than migrants feeling public service had been improved.

Over twice as high a percentage of old residents as migrants (81.0 to 40.6) felt that migration made taxes worse. Very few old residents, 5.3 percent, said that migration had no effect on taxes compared to 20 percent of the migrants.

A high proportion of the respondents were cognizant of the changes in property values, some in changes in public services and again many were aware of changes

Table 31: Effects of Migration on Local Government as Viewed by Old Residents and Migrants

| Types of Effects | Old Residents | | Migrants | | Total | |
|------------------|---------------|---------|----------|---------|--------|---------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Improved | 23 | 17.3 | 75 | 44.1 | 98 | 32.3 |
| No effect | 79 | 59.4 | 92 | 54.1 | 171 | 56.5 |
| Impaired | 31 | 23.3 | 3 | 1.8 | 34 | 11.2 |
| Total | 133 | 100.0 | 170 | 100.0 | 303 | 100.0 |

$$\chi^2 = 47.83$$

2 d.f.

Significant at .01 level

Table 33: Types of Effects of Migration on Property Value, Public Services, and Taxes as Viewed by Old Residents and Migrants

| Types of Effects | Old Residents | | Migrants | | Total | |
|------------------------------|---------------|---------|----------|---------|--------|---------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Property Value ⁶ | | | | | | |
| Improved | 110 | 82.7 | 155 | 91.2 | 265 | 87.4 |
| No effect | 13 | 9.8 | 13 | 7.6 | 26 | 8.6 |
| Impaired | 10 | 7.5 | 2 | 1.2 | 12 | 4.0 |
| Total | 133 | 100.0 | 170 | 100.0 | 303 | 100.0 |
| ----- | | | | | | |
| Public Services ² | | | | | | |
| Improved | 43 | 32.3 | 97 | 57.0 | 140 | 46.2 |
| No effect | 72 | 54.2 | 71 | 41.8 | 143 | 47.2 |
| Impaired | 18 | 13.5 | 2 | 1.2 | 20 | 6.6 |
| Total | 133 | 100.0 | 170 | 100.0 | 303 | 100.0 |
| ----- | | | | | | |
| Taxes ³ | | | | | | |
| Improved | 17 | 12.8 | 67 | 39.4 | 84 | 27.7 |
| No effect | 7 | 5.3 | 34 | 20.0 | 41 | 13.5 |
| Made Worse | 109 | 81.9 | 69 | 40.6 | 178 | 58.8 |
| Total | 133 | 100.0 | 170 | 100.0 | 303 | 100.0 |

1- $\chi^2 = 8.$

d.f. = 2 Significant at .05 level

2- $\chi^2 = 29.$

d.f. = 2 Significant at .01 level

3- $\chi^2 = 52.9$

d.f. = 2 Significant at .01 level

Table 32: Effects of Migration on Community Leadership, Finances of Community Organizations and Cooperation Among Organizations As Viewed by Old Residents and Migrants

| Types of Effects | Old Residents | | Migrants | | Total | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|---------|----------|---------|--------|---------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Community Leadership ¹ | | | | | | |
| Improved | 40 | 30.1 | 100 | 58.8 | 140 | 46.2 |
| No effect | 77 | 57.9 | 69 | 40.6 | 146 | 48.2 |
| Impaired | 16 | 12.0 | 1 | .6 | 17 | 5.6 |
| Total | 133 | 100.0 | 170 | 100.0 | 303 | 100.0 |
| ----- | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | |
| Finances | | | | | | |
| Improved | 75 | 56.4 | 121 | 71.2 | 196 | 64.7 |
| No effect | 57 | 42.8 | 49 | 28.8 | 106 | 35.0 |
| Impaired | 1 | .8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | .3 |
| Total | 133 | 100.0 | 170 | 100.0 | 303 | 100.0 |
| ----- | | | | | | |
| Cooperation ³ | | | | | | |
| Improved | 22 | 16.5 | 84 | 49.4 | 106 | 35.0 |
| No effect | 94 | 70.7 | 85 | 50.0 | 179 | 59.1 |
| Impaired | 17 | 12.8 | 1 | .6 | 18 | 5.9 |
| Total | 133 | 100.0 | 170 | 100.0 | 303 | 100.0 |

1 - $\chi^2 = 35.40$

d.f. = 2 Significant at .01 level

2 - $\chi^2 = 7.14$

d.f. = 1 Significant at .01 level

3 - $\chi^2 = 47.13$

d.f. = 2 Significant at .01 level

in taxes. However, the old residents had a high degree of agreement on their sentiments that taxes were worse, that is, higher than before. This increase parallels an increase in property evaluation, but unless there are accompanying adjustments in land use there will be increased economic pressures on the farmers.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The rural fringe is an area of rapid change and upheaval. The old residents are being forced to modify their behavior and re-evaluate their established mode of living. The migrants, who have not accepted the established traditional patterns of the rural fringe area are more willing to have the community and the institutions within the community change.

One result of the influx of migrants into a rural, primarily farm area is a need for both groups, the migrants and the non-migrants or old residents, to adjust to the changing situation. The present bulletin gives a report on specific aspects of the differences in adjustment between the old residents and migrants. These adjustment differences include factors such as satisfaction with the services of a community, the participation in activities and organizations, conflicts of opinions, and a feeling of belonging to the community.

The migrants were somewhat more dissatisfied with the community and with services of the community than were the old residents. Satisfaction with the water supply, police protection, and streets and roads was generally favorable with only minor differences in feelings between the two groups. However, with shopping facilities, fire protection and recreational facilities, the old residents were generally more satisfied than were the migrants. This could be explained by noting the urban source of origin of the migrants (see Bulletin 929). A large number of the migrants came from the metropolitan area of Columbus where such facilities as shopping and fire protection were more readily accessible. The increasing number of fringe shopping centers and outdoor recreational enterprises will likely be a major factor in the reduction of dissatisfaction among the migrants with the fringe community services that exist.

It might be noted that the services with which there is dissatisfaction will require adjustments in some of those services with which they are now satisfied. For example, better fire protection and recreation might well require the development of large water systems in in those areas where wells are the water supply. Also more public recreation may affect police protection, roads and others.

The meaning of improvement in taxes by 39 percent of the migrants may have more than one explanation. First, it may mean they are lower than they were in their previous place of residence, or second, it may mean taxes have been increased in order that services they desired could be provided. This ambiguity was not resolved in the answers given.

The old residents were generally more active in the extent of participation in formally organized groups and more frequently remained within their present community of residence to participate than did the migrants. A limited number of organizations, namely the church, farmers' organizations, and the school provided the major source of formal group participation.

Several conclusions result from these findings. The migrants move to the rural fringe physically but are less mobile both socially and psychologically. The old residents are the more active participants in formal activities within the community whereas, a larger number of migrants leave their present community of residence to engage in formal activities. This suggests a lag among the migrants in social migration and thus differential rates of integration into the activities and affairs of the local community of residence. The independent community of the rural fringe locale has been replaced by a metropolitan area largely interdependent in interaction networks.

Unlike the participation in formal activities where the old residents were the more active the more urban migrants were the more active in informal recreational activities but largely outside of the fringe communities they live in. The old residents more frequently participated in informal activity within a local community than did the migrants. The migrants are not only the more mobile in terms of physical migration but are more mobile in their choice of places in which to participate in formal and informal activities.

Several of the necessary economic services were studied. The only differences in use between the two groups were with the services that would be needed by a specific occupational category such as farmers. As with activities, however, there were important differences in where the services were acquired. The services were more frequently derived from a local or neighboring community by the old residents and from Columbus by the migrants.

Community integration was measured by means of whether or not the respondents considered themselves to be newcomers, the length of time it took to become

acquainted with the community leaders and residents, the difficulty involved in becoming acquainted with the community residents, the extent to which the residents knew one another, and the extent to which the old and new residents tended to remain distinct and separate. With the exception of the length of time it took to become acquainted with the community leaders and residents, each measure provided significantly different responses from the old residents and migrants. The old residents were more integrated into the community than were the migrants on most of the measures. The old residents considered themselves as old residents, felt less difficulty in becoming acquainted with other community residents, were more likely to feel that the residents knew one another, but were more likely to feel that the groups tended to remain distinct and separate. This last factor seems to demonstrate a higher degree of consciousness of differences between the two groups by the old residents.

Other indices of integration into the community was the extent which the old residents and migrants felt a need for additional services and facilities, noted conflicts between the groups in goals and ideas and stated disadvantages of living in the rural fringe. The migrants more frequently stated the need for additional services and facilities; more frequently stated some disadvantages of living in the fringe, but less frequently noted conflicts between the groups in goals and ideas. These findings are consistent with the previous community integration measures of the preceding paragraph. Perhaps the greater lack of a sensitivity toward conflict among the migrants may in itself express a lack of integration into the affairs and life of the community. That is, the assumption would be that the more integrated an individual is within a community, group, or specific organization, the greater would be the sensitivity toward conflict. In these three additional indices (need for services, conflict of goals, and disadvantages of fringe living) the old residents are also shown to be more highly integrated into the local community.

It is apparent from the differences in participation, differences in community integration into the institution of the community and the views about conflict areas that there is likewise a difference between old residents and migrants on the structure and cohesiveness of their respective group systems.

Old residents participating in established cliques or informal group systems, in local organizations and leadership roles showed an awareness toward cleavages as well as control over local systems that migrants did not have. Also the old residents had been involved in the organized structures in their communities for many years. This established system is very difficult to upset by newcomers. Newcomers were not

involved in established local systems. Lack of more complete migration leaves them alone and not included in systems of communication and power and therefore isolated and ineffective in the very important informal decision making process. The place the newcomers could be most effective was when voting occurred on such things as school issues, allowing these more isolated residents to express their interests as an aggregate of votes.

This comparison demonstrates the function of the structuring of relationships in a transitional community of this type. Control tends to remain at the small community level until pressures of the large mass of newcomers finally begin to get the issues put on the ballot. Then the pattern begins to feel the weight of the influx of new people with their needs and views becoming felt more and more. This point in the process signals parallel changes in tax levies, land values, public services, and institutions such as schools, churches and government.

The consequences that migration to the rural fringe had on institutions and other selected factors was perceived differently by the old residents and migrants. The impact of migration on church services, finances, and inter-church cooperation was viewed more favorably by the migrants than by the old residents. Very few respondents, however, either migrants or old residents, felt that these factors had been strongly impaired.

There was general agreement among both the old residents and the migrants that the school system in terms of curriculum, size, quality of teachers, and buildings and equipment had been improved. The old residents expressed the only resentment with the school system. This dissatisfaction involved the size of the school which was a direct consequence of migration.

Significant differences existed between the old residents and the migrants as to their opinions about the impact that migration had on local government. More migrants than old residents felt that migration had improved local government.

As with the impact of migration on the church, school, and local government, the migrants replied more frequently than did the old residents that the community leadership, community finances, and community cooperation among organizations had been improved. Very few respondents felt that these factors had been impaired.

The impact of migration on property value, and public services was generally viewed by the respondents as improved. However, both the old residents and the migrants felt that migration had made taxes worse. But this was expressed by twice as large a percentage of old residents as migrants.

In order to fully appreciate the implications which the study has for the fringe population of Ohio, it must be realized that the developing fringe segments of the state are not a homogeneous mass. Throughout Ohio, people differ, and the people within the rural fringe are no exception. The migrants and the non-migrants have different interests, adjust to the community at different rates, and select non-community areas for many activities and services in varying degrees. This suggests that in spite of a large proportion of old residents the fringe area possesses little unity and solidarity. This changing pattern of solidarity points the way for further changes that are occurring including the eventual breakdown of the social systems of the traditional local communities being effected, and for the community, therefore, to become a considerably larger and more cosmopolitan system.

These factors have very important implications for individuals with interests which range from city planning to farming. To implement change, it is essential to take into consideration the characteristics and the adjustment patterns of the people in the particular locale in which the change is desired.

Finally a note should be made of the gradually diminishing separation of the rural and the urban

segments of the population in the fringe. The rural fringe is being pushed out farther and farther. This becomes an area of conflict as well as accomodation for the two patterns of life and as this fringe advances the modes of rural and urban life stand in relief. Farm land is intermingled with industrial sites and residential communities. The location of participation in various formal and informal organizations and activities occurs both in the local community as well as in neighboring communities. The values of the fringe people encompass factors traditionally associated with both rural and urban locales.

For any one community this gentle clash of cultures will occur with its accompanying emphasis of the differences, followed by an accommodation, an integration and a final subsiding into the modern urbanism of the suburban metropolitan community. But it has not altogether yielded its rurality and neither has it become urban. Instead it is the new community of American living which is being sought by the urbanite who has rural values for living. The new community gives continuance to the rural traditions of space, quiet, family idealism and dreams of peace from urban pressures.